## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

SVEND LA ROSE,

No. C 10-2472 RS

Plaintiff,

v.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY CASE SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR LACK OF PROSECUTION

\*\*E-filed 10/14/10\*\*

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, et al.,

Defendants.

Plaintiff filed this action on June 4, 2010. On June 16, 2010, the then-assigned magistrate judge sent a letter directing plaintiff to either consent or decline to consent to the jurisdiction of a magistrate judge no later than June 25, 2010. Plaintiff did not respond, and the action was reassigned to the undersigned.

Plaintiff's in forma pauperis application was granted. On July 23, 2010, the Clerk of the Court requested plaintiff to provide addresses for service on defendants, to permit compliance with the order granting in forma pauperis status. Plaintiff has not responded.

On October 14, 2010, the duly-noticed initial Case Management Conference was called, but plaintiff failed to appear. Accordingly, on November 4, 2010, at 1:30 p.m., in Courtroom 3, Seventeenth Floor of the Court, located at 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA, plaintiff

## Case 3:10-cv-02472-RS Document 12 Filed 10/14/10 Page 2 of 2

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

1	shall appear and
2	Failure to appear
3	
4	IT IS SO ORDE
5	
6	Dated: 10/14/10
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
<ul> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>25</li> <li>26</li> <li>27</li> <li>28</li> </ul>	
28	
	ı

shall appear and show cause, if any, why this case should not be dismissed for lack of prosecuti	ion
Failure to appear will result in dismissal of the action.	
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
21.121	

RICHARD SEEBORG UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE